



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,627	06/27/2003	Zongqi Hu		1345

7590 01/12/2005  
Mr. Walter J. Tencza Jr.,  
Suite 3  
10 Station Place  
Metuchen, NJ 08840

EXAMINER

SANDERS JR, JOHN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3737

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/608,627	Applicant(s) HU ET AL. <span style="float: right;">CH</span>	
	Examiner John R. Sanders	Art Unit 3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6272003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Inventorship*

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim is composed of more than one sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over**  
**“Visual Evoked Potential Assessment of the Effects of Glaucoma on Visual Subsystems,”**  
**Vision Research 38 (1998) to Greenstein et al. (“Greenstein”), of record.**

Greenstein discloses medical testing associated with glaucoma wherein a modulated isolated check stimulus is presented to the eye at multiple frequencies, including 12 Hz (p. 1902, § 2.2). The evoked brain potentials are recorded in response to the stimuli by electrodes placed on the scalp and the recorded data is analyzed by applying a discrete Fourier transform and the multivariate statistic  $T^2_{\text{circ}}$ . Signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) are then derived from the  $T^2_{\text{circ}}$  statistic (p. 1904, § 2.3.3).

Greenstein lacks or does not expressly disclose displaying an indication of a high or low likelihood of glaucoma based on the signal processing.

However, Greenstein describes the results of the experiment as follows:

Greenstein discloses that “significant differences in log SNR values between the control subjects and the OAG (open-angle glaucoma) subjects” were found as a result of the experiment (p. 1906, § 3.3, column 2). Greenstein further plots values of amplitude and phase data for the subjects with positive log SNR values, in effect plotting only signals distinguishable from noise. Greenstein states that these plots “illustrate how few of the subjects from the OAG and glaucoma suspect groups have response components that are distinguishable from noise” (p. 1907, column 1). From the results of the experimentation, one of ordinary skill in the art would draw the conclusion that SNR values for visual evoked potentials calculated using the  $T^2_{\text{circ}}$  statistic are indicative (or at least suggestive) of the presence of glaucoma. From such a conclusion, one of ordinary skill in the art would likewise find it obvious to use the SNR values as a glaucoma diagnostic indicator, i.e. comparing measured SNR values to a critical value wherein the absence of a critical number of distinguishable VEP signals results in a positive glaucoma diagnosis.

Art Unit: 3737

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automate such a process since it has been held that merely using a computer to automate a known process does not by itself impart nonobviousness to the invention. See *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 227-30, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976); *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John R. Sanders whose telephone number is (571) 272-4742. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
JRS

  
ELENI MANTIS-MERCADER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER